

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-3 stand rejected. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and to render all claims at issue patentably distinct over the references cited.

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract. This objection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, the Abstract has been reformatted pursuant to the Examiner's request. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1 through 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Willis (U.S. 3,839,637) in view of Gerber et al. (U.S. 4,401,001). This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is believed that the originally filed claims are patentably distinct from these cited references. None of the cited references teach use of "machine-readable markers." Furthermore, neither Willis nor Gerber teach cutting of airbags from airbag fabric.

In contrast, Willis teaches manual, human eye reading of fluorescent material on clothing fabric and manual cutting. Further in contrast, Gerber does not teach, suggest or motivate use of machine-readable markers or cutting of an airbag guided by the machine-readable markers included in the weave. Moreover, Gerber teaches away from an airbag fabric by employing an air permeable material (see Gerber, column 6, lines 38-39). In fact, Gerber teaches a cutting device guided by pre-determined lines of cut defined in a program tape 20, which are certainly not included in the woven threads (see Gerber, column 3, lines 4-20). These differences are significant. For example,

paragraph 0007 of applicant's originally filed application discusses the advantages of employing machine-readable markers to guide the cutting operation. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

Finally, it is noted that the Examiner has crossed off two of the foreign patent documents cited in Applicant's 1449 form. No explanation was given for this non-consideration. These two foreign references were enclosed with Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement filing, as can be proven by the PTO-stamped return postcard (which can be provided to the Examiner upon request). Thus, a new 1449 form, noting the two deleted foreign references is being again filed herewith along with extra copies of these two references. It is requested that the Examiner consider these references, initial the 1449 Form, and send a copy back to Applicant's representative. No fee should be required for consideration of these duplicate copies.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's representative with any questions or suggestions.

In view of the instant amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that the Examiner pass the case to issue at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 6, 2005

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

By: 

Monte L. Falcoff  
Reg. No. 37,617